Susan M. Johnson

Pennsylvania's Social History and Pennsylvania German Studies: A Look at the Eighteenth Century

The purpose of this essay is to consider the implications that recent social histories of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania have for a new understanding of Pennsylvania German identity. The fields are related and share many similarities. Both ask questions about the ordinary lives of everyday people, and both use a great variety of sources. These include the statistical: records of birth and death, tombstone inscriptions, family trees, tax and assessment lists, census reports, emigration interviews, immigrant servant contracts, servant auction records, and all manner of church records; as well as the non-statistical: personal letters and diaries.[1] In addition, the two disciplines have each produced a staggering amount of research. According to Don Yoder, "Of all the ethnic groups of early Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Germans have been both the most vocal and the most researched."[2] But, as we shall see, the field of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania social history has matched Pennsylvania German studies for scholarly production. The difference between the two fields lies in the amount of research done *recently*. The social history of Europe and America from the Middle Ages on took off twenty to thirty years ago just a decade or two after the bulk of scholars in Pennsylvania German, scholars like Preston Barba, Walter Boyer, Albert Buffington, Russell Gilbert, Heinz Kloss, Marion Dexter Learned, Wilbur Oda, Harry Hess Reichard, Earl Robacher, Alfred Shomaker, and John Stoudt were retiring—and not being replaced with scholars in the field. To date, revisions of the social history of Pennsylvania have not been examined for their impact upon the conventional view of Pennsylvania German culture and ethnicity. For this reason, the time for such an examination has come.

From an updated and more precise portrayal of life in colonial Pennsylvania, it should be possible to estimate more accurately the true status of Pennsylvania German culture within the larger social configuration. At the same time, it must be remembered that the social history of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania may always be incomplete. We still cannot say what life was like for all colonial Pennsylvanians throughout the century. Despite all recent gains, and they are considerable, the line between the unique and the generalizable remains somewhat obscure, although on occasion even the most discerning

historian is tempted to make the leap of analogy, to suppose what "must have been true" for similar areas.[3] For the purposes of this analysis, then, studies of Philadelphia, Germantown, Reading, Southeast Pennsylvania, Lancaster County, and the "backcountry" will be viewed as part of a composite only, not an absolute description, but a representative model for comparison to the traditional portrayal of the Pennsylvania Germans. The model begins with the migrant experience.

Social historians have rendered our view of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century immigration to North America more comprehensive and comparative, and have put the circumstances of Pennsylvania's immigrants into a larger perspective. They agree that eighteenth-century emigrants left many areas of Europe, not only German-speaking areas, for similar reasons: overpopulation, wars, high taxes, bad weather that destroyed crops, partible inheritance practices that rendered many poverty stricken, and generally increased indebtedness.[4] From German-speaking areas they were drawn and actively recruited to numerous locations in Russia, Prussia, Austria, France, and Spain, often after many long years of migrating within their own countries and regions.[5] Within this larger mural of European emigration, the transatlantic migration of English- and German-speakers to North America was unique because it resulted not from a government program to attract settlers, but from a market-based business venture that accommodated the needy, profited the wealthy, and created economic opportunities for those in between.[6] New evidence suggests, additionally, that specific groups where drawn to specific locations not only for the promise of opportunity, but also for the safety of informal social networks. From Nova Scotia to the Mosquito Coast, emigrants tended to follow the path of people they knew.[7] In the case of the German-speaking immigrants to Pennsylvania these pathways shaped the immigration into Philadelphia as well as further settlement across the commonwealth to the south and west.[8]

It is now widely recognized that the momentum of the market-based economy that financed the migration also gave shape to colonial life, drawing immigrants together in the New World and forcing them apart. By the early eighteenth century, Pennsylvania was not the frontier wilderness many have imagined, but a rapidly growing marketplace.[9] As Stephanie Wolf has put it: "Contrary to the title of Carl Bridenbaugh's well-known book, there is no such thing as a 'city in the wilderness.'"[10] The largest cities and tiniest towns depended on customers from the surrounding countryside, and, conversely, rural farmers and artisans relied on the market provided by cities and towns.[11] The fundamental basis of this market was land, so much so that the eighteenth century can easily be called a land rush. Immigrants rushed first to acquire land, and then to turn that land into capital either by selling it for a profit, or by transforming it into marketable goods through family, servant, and/or slave labor. Scholars uniformly agree that this belief in the inherent right of the individual to acquire land and to accumulate wealth generated the extreme individualism and self-interest that characterized the Middle Colonies,

distinguished them from New England and the Southern Colonies, and made them the prototype for the westward expansion of North American society.[12]

Also widely recognized today is the ethnic diversity of colonial Pennsylvania. The land rush and the marketplace that sprang up in its wake brought a great mix of people together: Native Americans, English, Dutch, German, Swiss, Swedes, Scotch-Irish, French, and Africans, Lutherans, Reformed, Anglicans, Quakers, Catholics, Mennonites, Amish, Presbyterians, Baptists, Dunkards, Free Thinkers, Separatists, Schwenkfelders, Jews, assorted hermits, and a substantial number who espoused to no faith at all.[13] But, significantly, it did not necessarily bring them closer together in meaningful ways. Belief in the right to property went hand-in-hand with a belief in the right to privacy, to guard the "private sphere," for which the Germans, in particular, were well known.[14] The vast majority of colonists and immigrants tended to stick to themselves and leave others alone, and, perhaps surprisingly, there was little community spirit or interaction.[15] Pennsylvania cities and towns had equally diverse and quite rigid socio-economic structures. In Reading in 1773, for example, less than 250 taxpayers living in one-half square mile fell into nine distinct occupations with artisans in thirty-five different specialties.[16] Even in the countryside, only 60-70 percent were farmers, and according to Lemon, this number sank to 30 percent in some townships in Lancaster and Chester counties.[17] Even on the frontier in Middletown in 1779, 25 of 72 taxpayers were craftsmen.[18] Paxton listed forty-two in the same year.[19] When we consider that virtually all types of work in cities and rural areas were also done by black Africans through the 1770s, the mix of peoples, nationalities, skin color, languages, religion, and occupations is impressive.[20] But the mix was clearly divided along economic lines with roughly 10 percent of the population controlling up to 30 percent of any area's wealth.[21]

As has been noted time and time again, Pennsylvania was not really "the best poor man's country."[22] To be sure, the majority of those who arrived early with capital and mature families tended to increase their wealth substantially, but those who arrived early without capital and mature families, and those who arrived later, after the 1730s, rarely improved their lots over a lifetime.[23] For all of the luxury and services enjoyed by the wealthy, employment opportunities simply did not keep up with population growth,[24] and unemployment soared. Servitude among British subjects in Philadelphia was at 29 percent in 1773 and among Germans at 45 percent between 1785 and 1804, figures that are indeed lower than previously believed by twenty percentage points.[25] But lower incidence of servitude does not correlate with a higher incidence of independent income or employment. An estimated third of Philadelphia's residents (the same percentage as in European cities) struggled to make ends meet and could be forced below the poverty level by any number of random events: shifts in the market place, unemployment, bad weather, accident, illness, pregnancy, or the addition of a child to the family.[26] Debt was a widespread problem for all colonists, including Germans,[27] and according to B. G. Smith, the poor dressed

and ate like prisoners or wards of the poorhouse with many resorting to stealing to get by.[28] Even when available, charity did not scratch the surface of the need.[29] "Giving" in the City of Brotherly Love was astonishingly meager, in amounts that covered one-thousandth of the real need, and the "Society for the Assistance of Needy and Poor" was not founded until 1794.[30] Given available statistics, a poor person could conceivably have received little more than one charitable meal in a calendar year.

These inequities caused much resentment and many social problems. One was a rapid increase in tenancy and extremely crowded conditions, and landlords could be surprisingly unchristian in their treatment of tenants, often putting families and children into the streets.[31] Tenants then went in search of new lodgings and work, and in so doing joined a mass of colonial migrants for, contrary to what many imagine of the eighteenth century, transience and mobility was the rule rather than the exception.[32] Studies conducted by Jackson Turner Main, James Lemon, Stephanie Wolf, and George Franz indicate a mobility rate ranging from 30-50 percent per decade among the landed classes near the coast as well as in frontier towns, where the rate could skyrocket even higher.[33] Most work in the seaport and countryside was seasonal.[34] Large numbers of immigrants roamed the cities and towns in search of work, and many left bitterly poor country families to seek work in the cities, all joining together in the same unemployed masses that had prompted them to leave Europe in the first place. This transience amongst immigrants contributed, understandably, to a feeling of alienation within the community as a whole. Social historians concur that there was, in fact, no solid base to social life that might have unified people, not even, as is now widely recognized, the church.[35]

Of course, it goes without saying that many of these poor and transient were women. Feminist historians have recently documented the fact that many women, in addition to running the home, made substantial contributions to the family income, particularly in the lucrative butter industry, contributions often superior to that of their husbands.[36] But these successful women were still in the minority. Twenty to forty-five percent of the women in two Philadelphia wards, for example, worked as servants or slaves in 1775.[37] Marriages often failed, as they do today, because of the differing expectations partners brought to their relationships, and the majority of female heads of household were much poorer than their married counterparts.[38] Courts frequently prosecuted female defendants for debt and a variety of crimes.[39]

It is not surprising then to learn that recent studies of eighteenth-century family structure and function mirror the problems and changes of the larger society. The family was as associational and mobile as the larger society, and hardly resembled our idealized version of extended families in days gone by. To be sure, where families had the means to live together, the dominant pattern was the nuclear family living in a single dwelling, adhering to the practice of partible inheritance, and families took basic care of their children. But children grew up fast and left home early to make their own way, and, surprisingly, there is little

evidence of warm kinship ties.[40] In eighteenth-century Pennsylvania, opportunities favored individuals free of responsibility, ready to move, and open to new ways. The family that prepared children for these opportunities best was the small family, pragmatic and utilitarian, a necessary, but temporary station in a single life.[41] Within any family, individual members could drift into vastly different lifestyles, even different religions, with stronger commitments to them than to the nuclear family itself, as clearly evidenced in Leo Shelbert's study of the Thommen family.[42]

Minus the advances in industry, medicine, and technology of the last two hundred years, in fact, everyday life in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania bore an uncanny resemblance to the society we live in today. Indeed, social historians tend to view life in the eighteenth century as qualitatively modern because of its mix of ethnic groups, market economy, disparate social classes, and dense population. They recognize that unemployment, exploitation, squalid poverty, social alienation, the breakdown of the family, and all related problems, so often blamed on nineteenth-century urbanization and the industrial revolution, already plagued the Middle Colonies in the eighteenth century.[43] Colonials in this region seem to have been caught in a historical moment in which family ties weakened before the development of any compensating "community accountability."[44] Finally, the efficient, market-based relocation of Germans to America that relied on the profit motive, the assistance of established ethnic communities, and flexible financing and credit, established a precedent for the mass migrations of the nineteenth century.[45] One might say, then, that the eighteenth century ushered in the deprivations and injustices of the century to follow.

So much for every wistful, romantic notion we ever had of the first Pennsylvania Germans. Where in this picture, data, and statistics are they? Where are the hard-working but happy, prosperous but humble Pennsylvania Germans eating apple butter and scrapple, and singing folksongs with their extended families on pristine farms? Statistically, nowhere. The demands of survival seem to have precluded any concern for the maintenance of an ethnic culture. The lives of ordinary people were fraught with enormous uncertainty. In addition to the obvious threats of war, Indian attack, and disease, colonial life was highly complex and risky. Bailyn claims that political factions "reduced the politics of certain colonies to an unchartable chaos," and no matter how pacific Tully's portrayal of Philadelphia politics between 1725 and 1755, local histories support Bailyn.[46] Even more significantly, those who emerged unscathed from the endless fallout from political wrangling could only have fallen into two groups: the landless or the landed. Häberlein has already demonstrated that "landlessness was synonymous with poverty,"[47] and, while the landed may have eluded abject poverty, for most of the century throughout the commonwealth they struggled, if they did not actually come to blows, over clear titles to their property. Shepard estimates over 100,000 squatters on the frontier alone in 1726, and the practice continued past the establishment of the Mason and Dixon Line

in the 1760s.[48] All of these squatters stood in danger of losing their property for any number of reasons over periods extending in some locations over a lifetime. The story of land titles in Pennsylvania, beginning with William Penn's illness and death, is notorious, well documented, and testifies to the fact that acquiring and holding on to property constituted an enormous gamble for most land owners.[49] Landless (meaning poor) or landed, with worries of this magnitude, who had time to reflect on "identity," ethnic or otherwise?

This is not to say that there where no ethnic German communities, the Ephrata Cloister being one good example. That colonial America was ethnic from the very beginning, and that some groups were German-speaking are undisputed points.[50] That this ethnicity generated a meaningful identity for individuals, however, is questionable. There is no written evidence of the term "Pennsylvania German" in the eighteenth century, and no evidence to suggest a linking of identity among German-speakers from isolated religious clusters whose numbers were, relative to the total number of German-speakers, very small. The social history fails to turn up our "Pennsylvania Germans," not in name, and certainly not in the ennobled configuration that we might imagine. As Stephanie Wolf has observed in Germantown, these myths seem

> to be based partially on nineteenth-century observations of rural Pennsylvania Dutch life-styles and a superimposition of them onto the history of Germantown; and partially on grandmother and grandfather reminiscences of a time that seemed stable and close knit, in comparison to the vastly different way of life brought about by the introduction of the railroad and the factory system.[51]

What we associate with the term "Pennsylvania German" is perhaps best regarded as a modern construct.

Some of what we have learned about the Pennsylvania Germans turns out, in fact, to be erroneous. It is a commonplace in Pennsylvania, and was at the time of Benjamin Franklin, to hear that the advanced agricultural development of Pennsylvania resulted from the superior farming practices of the Pennsylvania German farmers. This was not entirely correct. Even though agricultural practices produced a more than adequate diet, one of "rude plenty,"[52] the farmers of southeastern Pennsylvania, the heart of Pennsylvania German country, farming the most productive soil in North America, did not farm as productively or as efficiently as their "contemporary English" counterparts.[53] Moreover, this failure seems to have resulted from nothing more than sheer complacency. While the soil supported them in a comfortable lifestyle, and better than what many or most remembered from Europe, they contented themselves with very low production in their fields and livestock, and ignored the warnings and advice of agricultural reformers who urged them repeatedly to rotate and fertilize fields, to exercise more care in the feeding and breeding of livestock, and to cut the cost of labor.[54]

And this recalcitrance cannot be blamed on the ignorance of the "Dumb Dutch," a label one still hears frequently in Pennsylvania. The literacy rate of adult German males who arrived in Philadelphia between 1727 and 1775 was about 70 percent and reached mass literacy by the time of the Revolution. German immigrants were as literate or better than the general colonial population and the populations they emigrated from, and may have increased literacy in Pennsylvania by 15 percent.[55] Evidence from servant contracts for German children between 1771 and 1804 indicate that "the proportion of servants receiving education was high," equally high for both genders, and increased over the last quarter of the century.[56] Book ownership and the trading of German and English books was common.[57] As the social history makes clear, then, the literate "Dutch" were probably no dumber or smarter than their colonial counterparts.

Were there any Pennsylvania Germans in colonial Pennsylvania? From the bulk of evidence on which social historians agree, one would have to say "probably not." What we imagine today as an ethnic identity probably did not exist before the nationalistic and regionalistic waves of the nineteenth century.[58] And yet, a clearly defined ethnic group did emerge in the nineteenth century, and surely not out of thin air. What, if anything, transpired in the eighteenth century that allowed for an ethnic "congealing" in the nineteenth? The answer to this puzzle might lie in those areas about which social historians fail to concur. The first is the issue of harmony. Some scholars emphasize the relative harmony that existed within the mélange of national, racial, religious, and social classes by focusing on the precedent for diversity established in the earliest years of settlement and on William Penn's ideology of tolerance. Greene, for example, warns against exaggerating "both the extent and the importance of [ethnic] variations" and points out that the "rich cultural diversity of the Middle Colonies should not blind scholars to the emergence of a common culture core as a result of a steady process of social amalgamation."[59] He concludes that "in their housing and in their farm buildings, in their agricultural practices, in their diet, and in their willingness to move, they all displayed an astonishing similarity."[60] Schwarz argues that "Pennsylvanians tended to ignore potentially divisive differences," as a result of "some mixture of a number of factors that were conducive to group interaction, tolerance, or at least indifference."[61] She goes on to claim that "perhaps because of continual interaction with 'outsiders,' firm stereotypes tended not to develop. Preconceived notions about a particular group broke down as its members were viewed as individuals."[62] Becker found that "prejudice [against Jews and Catholics] in Reading was isolated rather than systematic."[63] Tully goes so far as to suggest that community members "formed familylike attachments . . . to form organic communities that in turn gave order, context, purpose, and—at the risk of being trite—meaning to the men and women who were members," which, one must concede, may have occurred in certain places at certain times.[64] Finally, Lemon claims that "polemics, jealousy, and German newspapers were not necessarily signs of deep social divisions," and

that "interaction among members of groups was common in rural areas."[65] From these descriptions, one might easily envision an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence in Pennsylvania communities.

But these same and other scholars also emphasize the fierce guarding of the private sphere that dominated colonial Pennsylvania, and the squabbling, criticisms, and deeply held antipathies between groups and within groups of Germans themselves. Even Tully admits that "at any given time, clashes between personalities who agreed completely on the importance of peace and amity were certain to be taking place,"[66] and Franz has demonstrated that religious and ethnic differences could be "polarized" by outside pressures, real and perceived.[67] Yoder highlights the lack of cordiality between the Germans and the Irish, which escalated into dutch-irish riots on election days, quoting a Scottish observer: "the very sound of an Irishman's voice will make a Dutchman draw down his eyebrows, gather up his pockets, and shrick [*sic*] into himself like a tortoise."[68] In a rigorous exposé of German cantankerousness, Roeber notes that Christopher Sauer, son of the well-known German newspaper publisher, "nearly lost all hope of deterring German speakers from suing one another," while Pennsylvnia lawyers claimed that: "If we did not have the Germans, two lawyers would have to ride on one horse."[69] It may well be that such discord was generally internal, not between groups. But when the interaction of diverse groups can be described as "a general lack of antagonism" and as evidence of "peace and harmony" even by the same author in the same article, there is much room for interpretation, and the issue appears to be a case of the glass being half-full or half-empty.[70]

The second issue open to interpretation is that of continuity. Was there continuity in the lives of immigrants and their grandchildren, or was the transatlantic crossing a break with the past and a step into a new culture? Virtually all of the social historians of the eighteenth century emphasize the similarities and continuity among peoples who left Europe for the same reasons, at the same time, under the same circumstances, and faced the same hardships and challenges.[71] But most of these and others also point out the inherent, dramatic differences between regional European groups, the fact that English-speaking and German-speaking peoples hailed from very different areas and circumstances within their own language group, and often had nothing in common.[72] Yoder is particularly clear on this point with regard to the Pennsylvnia Germans, and Becker identifies patent economic, political, and educational distinctions between the Lutheran and Reformed Germans in Reading.[73] Again, one need not read far to be struck with the contradictions inherent in this issue. Greene, who recognizes "astonishing similarity" in the lifestyle of diverse immigrant groups, also points out the "mélange of cultural configurations in which modes of land use, community structures, strength and nature of religious ties, inheritance practices, and patterns of family and social relations varied considerably within the same political jurisdictions."[74] So, we are left with both astonishing similarity and considerable variation. Considering

the length of most migrations, sometimes over generations even before leaving Europe, and considering that eighteenth-century Pennsylvania was a culture in transition, it is hard to judge the degree of continuity it offered to individual immigrants and families. The intrepid Anglicization of the Middle Colonies in general may have represented, at different times, continuity for some, culture shock for others.[75]

These areas of interpretation have implications for an understanding of Pennsylvania German cultural history. If we accept the view that adaptation to a newly emerging American culture united diverse groups into a relatively harmonious whole, then we might not expect regional European traditions, ideas, and values intact at the end of the century. If, on the other hand, we accept the view that there was continuity of lifestyle from Europe to America within individual groups that tolerated each other from a distance, then the survival of European culture in America, or of German culture in Pennsylvania, seems more plausible. In the case of the Pennsylvania Germans, as their name implies, both arguments seem to be valid.

German-speakers certainly constituted a "presence" in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania. By the middle of the century, and the height of German immigration, they comprised about 50 percent of the total population of the commonwealth.[76] They supported two German newspapers and their preference for authentic Gothic script put Benjamin Franklin's German newspaper out of business.[77] In their speech and manner of expression they maintained the same images and metaphors of farm and countryside that had been part of their discourse in small German villages.[78] They truly struggled with English notions of law and property, tended to be less economically well-off than their English neighbors, and less likely to engage in politics or community leadership.[79] They lived more or less apart from their neighbors, and were most welcome among them when it was thought that they had money to purchase land and goods.[80] While often praised publicly, German-speakers were viewed privately by many as different and unsavory, surly and ill-natured,[81] and were frequently the scapegoats of disgruntled politicians.[82] They did not attract the attention of Benjamin Franklin and prompt his notorious comment about "Palatine boors" because they blended into the landscape.[83] Perhaps the best evidence for the maintenance of German culture in Pennsylvania and the Middle Colonies comes from Thomas Jefferson who, while traveling in the Rhineland recognized "the origin of whatever is not English among us," and "fancied [him]self in the upper parts of Maryland and Pennsylvania."[84] Clearly, then, the Germans were distinguishable from their neighbors.

But the Pennsylvania half of the label was also pregnant with meaning in the eighteenth century. There is no evidence to suggest that German-speakers wanted to maintain their regional European identity or that German-speakers in one group "identified" with those in another.[85] For newly arrived immigrants there was little to be gained by it, and, as mentioned earlier, much else to worry about.[86] The persistence of the German language, it has been suggested, may

have been due to continued immigration more than from any "conscious effort to retain ethnicity."[87] The Germans had been encouraged from day one by Pastorius and others to speak English for their survival and the betterment of their children.[88] English was spoken by many of them fairly early, and English church services, especially for young people, were common. By 1764, Henry Miller abandoned the practice of referring to German historical images in his German newspaper because his readers no longer responded to them.[89] The lives of most colonials had a distinctively English flavor to it.[90] Finally, many German-speakers, though not all, joined the revolutionary movement and were accepted as active participants and patriots, surely testimony to their integration into American society.[91]

Between the notions of harmony and continuity bantered about by social historians, then, we find in the Pennsylvania Germans a sort of equilibrium. Yes, the Germans retained their "Germanness" and were identifiable as such well up to the end of the eighteenth century. Yes, they adapted quickly and were accepted—even if at a distance. And, yes, as some claim, they may have assumed a public English face while maintaining a German one in private.[92] They were distinctive and assimilating all at once, we must acknowledge, at different rates in different locations. The Germans in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania exhibit some of what will become a genuine ethnic identity in the nineteenth century, but it has not yet congealed. It has not yet linked the various German-speaking groups into one, if, in fact, it ever will. Like many other groups at the end of the eighteenth century, the Pennsylvania Germans are poised on the edge.

The forces that will push them over are numerous and go beyond the scope of this investigation. But one force has already been at work in the eighteenth century and bears mentioning. That is the assignation or superimposition of identity onto the group. Much blame and maligning for this has fallen to the filiopietistic writers of the nineteenth century and to the tourist industry of the twentieth century.[93] But, in truth, such rhapsodizing and mythologizing was well underway in the middle of the eighteenth century when Christopher Sauer contrasted "English cunning" and "ungodly English law" with "German Virtue" and "godly German-speaking pietists."[94] Benjamin Rush's now legendary praise of the "German Inhabitants of Pennsylvania" had a tremendous impact on public thought, and his private scorn of them was shared by many of his fellow dignitaries.[95] Through these descriptions, the label "German" was taking on ever new definitions, and it may be that what is clearly documented for Germantown occurred throughout Pennsylvania, namely, that the label was being applied to a dynamic, evolving culture qualitatively different from the original.[96] By the end of the century, "German" would refer to an American hybrid that would continue to change over the next two hundred years.

To conclude, then, where social historians tend to agree, they paint a picture of life in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania that, for most people, bore a striking resemblance to the life of Hobbes primitive man: "solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short." It is as sobering as it is disillusioning. Where the picture is

muddled, however, they open the door for a careful analysis of the "Pennsylvania" and "German" halves of the label, and they have enriched that analysis with detail. From this, it is perhaps prudent to claim that if there were no ethnic Pennsylvania Germans in the eighteenth century, the seeds were being sown.

Susquehanna University
Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania

Notes

[1] For unusually creative use of these sources, the reader is referred to Stephanie Grauman Wolf, *Urban Village: Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800* (Princeton, 1976), 5; Bernard Bailyn, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1987); Farley Grubb, "Colonial Immigrant Literacy: An Economic Analysis of Pennsylvania-German Evidence, 1727-1775," *Explorations in Economic History* 24 (1987): 63-76; and id. "Educational Choice in the Era Before Free Public Schooling: Evidence from German Immigrant Children in Pennsylvania, 1771-1817," *The Journal of Economic History* 52,2 (1992): 363-375; and Marianne Wokeck, "A Tide of Alien Tongues: The Flow and Ebb of German Immigration to Pennsylvania, 1683-1775" (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1983). Billy G. Smith lists the following additional sources: "city directories; wills; inventories of estate; petitions for divorce, pardons, and pensions, dockets from the hospital, almshouse, and prison; merchants' and artisans' papers; maritime records of the port; ship's crew lists; oaths of allegiance; newspaper stories and advertisements; and indenture and apprentice rolls" in *The "Lower Sort": Philadelphia's Laboring People, 1750-1800* (Ithaca, 1990), 2.

[2] Don Yoder, "The Pennsylvania Germans: Three Centuries of Identity Crisis," in Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh, eds., *America and the Germans: An Assessment of a Three-Hundred-Year History* (Philadelphia, 1985), 1:41. As evidence for this claim, Yoder refers the reader to Emil Meynen, comp. and ed., *Bibliography on German Settlements in Colonial North America, Especially on the Pennsylvania Germans and Their Descendants, 1683-1933* (Leipzig, 1937) with a reminder that this 636-page work has double columns and that "the literature produced in the fifty-year period from 1933 to 1983 would fill an almost equally large volume" (62).

[3] Stephanie Grauman Wolf, "Hyphenated America: The Creation of an Eighteenth-Century German-American Culture," in Trommler and McVeigh, *America and the Germans* (Philadelphia, 1985), 1:71; Alan Tully, *William Penn's Legacy: Politics and Social Structure in Provincial Pennsylvania, 1726-1755* (Baltimore, 1977), 165; and George Franz, *Paxton: A Study of Community Structure and Mobility in the colonial Pennsylvania Backcountry* (New York, 1989), 119, 216.

[4] Mark Häberlein, "German Migrants in Colonial Pennsylvania: Resources, Opportunities, and Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 50, 3 (1993): 555-74; Bernard Bailyn, *The Peopling of British North America: An Introduction* (New York, 1985); David Grayson Allen, *In English Ways: The Movement of Societies and the Transferal of English Local Law and Custom to Massachusetts Bay in the Seventeenth Century* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1981); Ned S. Landsman, *Scotland and Its First American Colony, 1683-1765* (Princeton, NJ, 1985), and Randall Balmer, *A Perfect Babel of Confusion: Dutch Religion and English Culture in the Middle Colonies* (New York, 1989); Werner Hacker, *Auswanderungen aus Baden und dem Breisgau* (Stuttgart/Aalen, 1980); Marianne Wokeck, "The Flow and Composition of German Immigration to Philadelphia, 1727-1775," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 105 (1981): 249-78; Robert Selig, *Räutige Schafe und geizige Hirten: Studien zur Auswanderung aus dem Hochstift Würzburg im 18. Jahrhundert und ihre Ursachen* (Würzburg, 1988); David W. Sabean, *Property, Production, and Family in Neckerhausen, 1700-1870* (Cambridge, 1990); Lutz K. Berkner, "Inheritance, Land Tenure, and Peasant Family Structure: A German Regional Comparison," in Jack Goody et. al., eds., *Family and Inheritance: Rural Society in Western Europe, 1200-1800* (Cambridge, 1976), 71-95; A. G. Roeber, "The Origins and Transfer of

German-American Concepts of Inheritance," *Perspectives in American History*, n.s., 3 (1986): 117; George Fertig, "Migration from the German-speaking Parts of Central Europe, 1600-1800: Estimates and Explanations," Freie Universitat Berlin, John F. Kennedy Institut fur Nordamerikastudien, Working Paper No. 38/1991; Hermann Wellenreuther, "Image and Counterimage, Tradition and Expectation: The German Immigrants in English Colonial Society in Pennsylvania, 1700-1765," in Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh, eds., *America and the Germans*, 1: 85-105.

[5] Wokeck, "Harnessing the Lure of the 'Best Man's Country': The Dynamics of German-Speaking Immigration to British North America, 1683-1783," in Ida Altman and James Horn, *To Make America: European Emigration in the Early Modern Period* (Berkeley, 1991), 209-10.

[6] Wokeck, "Harnessing," 212 and 222; see also her discussion of indentured and redmptioner service and the advantages of the latter for German-speaking families, 217-18; and Lowell Colton Benion, "Flight from the Reich: A Geographic Exposition of Southwest German Emigration, 1683-1815" (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1971), chaps. 3 and 5; Werner Hacker, *Auswanderungen aus Baden und dem Breisgau*; Hans Fenske, "International Migration: Germany in the Eighteenth Century," *Central European History* 13 (1980): 344-46.

[7] Wolfgang von Hippel, *Auswanderung aus Südwestdeutschland: Studien zur württembergischen Auswanderung und Auswanderungspolitik im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1984), 46-47; Hans Ulrich Pfister, *Die Auswanderung aus dem Knonauer Amt, 1648-1750: ihr Ausmass, ihre Strukturen, und ihre Bedingungen* (Zürich, 1987), 150, 164-167, 290-295; Wokeck, "Harnessing," 222, 230-31.

[8] Wokeck, "Harnessing," 230-31.

[9] Gary B. Nash, "Social Development," in Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole, eds., *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Period* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1984), 233-61; James T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country: A Geographical Study of Early Southeastern Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972); Wolf, *Urban Village*; Patricia U. Bonomi, "The Middle Colonies: Embryo of the New Political Order," in Alden T. Vaughan and George Athan Billian, eds., *Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris* (New York, 1973), 63-92; Jerome H. Wood, *Conestoga Crossroads: Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1730-1790* (Harrisburg, PA, 1979).

[10] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 96; Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (New York, 1964).

[11] That life beyond the perimeter of the marketplace was difficult is evidenced by the settlers of Donegal on the Susquehanna River northeast of Harrisburg, then in Lancaster County, who in 1733 requested reduced quitrents because of their "inability to obtain money (since they were 'so far back from markets')." "Petition of Inhabitants of Donegal to Thomas Penn," 12 June 1733, quoted in Franz, *Paxton*, 97.

[12] Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, xv, 97; Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, ed. by Harold P. Simonson (New York, 1976), 44, 48-49; Douglas Greenberg, "The Middle Colonies in Recent American Historiography," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 36 (1979): 396-98; Alan Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 161-68; Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Developoment of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988), 26-27; Sam Bass Turner, *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth* (Philadelphia, 1968), 3-4.

[13] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 137-38; Laura L. Becker, "Diversity and its Significance in an Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania Town" in Michael Zuckerman, ed. *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, (Philadelphia, 1982), 197-98; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 9, 128-29; Janet McCauley, "Pioneering German Jesuits in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1741-81," *Social Justice Review* 58 (1965): 269-72, 304-8, 342-44; 58 (1966): 379-82, 414-18, 451-56; 59 (1966): 25-27, 62-65, 99-101, 145-57; for a fascinating analysis of the backgrounds of Philadelphia seamen, see B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort": Philadelphia's Laboring People, 1750-1800* (Ithaca, NY, 1990), 152-56.

[14] A. G. Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property: German Lutherans in Colonial British America* (Baltimore, 1993), 329.

[15] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 157, 216; for a startling analysis of this lack of community see George Franz, *Paxton: A Study of Community Structure and Mobility in the Colonial Pennsylvania Backcountry* (New York, 1989).

[16] Becker, "Diversity," 198.

[17] James Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 7-8, 141; see also Jacob M. Price, "Economic Function and the Growth of American Towns in the Eighteenth Century," *Perspectives in American History* 8 (1974): 123-86; Duane E. Ball, "Dynamics of Population and Wealth in Eighteenth-Century Chester County, Pennsylvania," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 6 (1976): 621-44; Alan Tully, "Economic Opportunity in Mid-Eighteenth Century Rural Pennsylvania," *Histoire Sociale* 9 (1976): 11-28; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 104-11, and "Artisans and the Occupational Structure of an Industrial Town: 18th-Century Germantown, Pa.," *Working Papers from the Regional Economic History Research Center* 1 (1977): 33-56; Becker, "Diversity," 198, 215.

[18] Franz, *Paxton*, 170.

[19] Franz, *Paxton*, 177.

[20] Greene reports that slaves "in both New York and Philadelphia . . . could be found working at virtually every conceivable task. They served as sailors, shipwrights, ropemakers, sailmakers, stevedores, teamsters, bakers, masons, carpenters, shoemakers, tailors, butchers, millers, hatters, skinners, brushmakers, distillers, sugar boilers, candlers, coopers, clockmakers, joiners, barbers, brewers, and domestics, as well as in a variety of still more specialized trades." *Pursuits of Happiness*, 134-35.

[21] Becker, "Diversity," 198; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 51-52, 85-88, 108-9; Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 72; James Lemon and Gary Nash, "The Distribution of Wealth in Eighteenth-Century America: A Century of Change in Chester County, Pennsylvania, 1693-1803," *Journal of Social History* 2 (1968): 11; Gary B. Nash, "Social Development," 248. See B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*," (93) for an interesting discussion of the myths of prosperity as put forth by Sam Bass Warner, *The Private City*, 7; Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776* (New York, 1955), 148-284; Carl Bridenbaugh and Jessica Bridenbaugh, *Rebels and Gentlemen: Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin* (New York, 1942), 10-11, 13; John J. McCusker, "Sources of Investment Capital in the Colonial Philadelphia Shipping Industry," *Journal of Economic History* 32 (1972): 146-57; and Jackson Turner Main, *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton, NJ, 1965), 194, 279.

[22] Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 228; B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort."*

[23] Mark Häberlein, "German Migrants in Colonial Pennsylvania: Resources, Opportunites, and Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 50, 3 (July 1993): 564-74.

[24] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 137; B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort,"* 91, 124; Lemon and Nash, "Distribution of Wealth," 621-44; Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, xiii; Jack Michel, "'In a Manner and Fashion Suitable to their Degree': A Preliminary Investigation of the Material Culture of Early Rural Pennsylvania," *Working Papers from the Regional Economic History Research Center* 5 (1981): 1-83; Joseph E. Illick, *Colonial Pennsylvania: A History* (New York, 1976), 136-63.

[25] Farley Grubb, "Servant Auction Records and Immigration into the Delaware Valley, 1745-1831: The Proportion of Females Among Immigrant Servants," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 133,2 (1989): 160-61; "The Incidence of Servitude in Trans-Atlantic Migration, 1771-1804," *Explorations in Economic History* 22 (1985): 334, 337.

[26] Greene and Pole, *Colonial British America*, 247-50; Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 39, 91, 124-25; Grubb, "Servant Auction Records," 155, 161; Häberlein, "German Migrants," 573; Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA, 1979), 233-63; Sharon V. Salinger, "Artisans, Journeymen, and the Transformation of Labor in Late Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 40 (1983): 62-84, and id. *"To Serve Well and Faithfully": Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800* (Cambridge, 1987).

[27] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 195.

[28] B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 125.

[29] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 249, 274.

[30] Ibid., 255-56.

[31] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 85-88, 94-95; Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 127; B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 9, 21, 160, 174, 178, 180-81, 195; Susan Branson, "Landlord-Tenant Relations in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Pennsylvania History* 62,4 (Fall 1995): 557-59; Robert J. Gough, "The Myth of the 'Middle Colonies': An Analysis of Regionalization in Early America," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 103 (1983): 408; Lucy Simler, "Tenancy in Colonial Pennsylvania: The Case of Chester County," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d. ser., 93 (1986): 546-48.

[32] Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 71; Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 173-75; Wolf, "Hyphenated America," 73-74; George Franz, *Paxton*, 120-58; Lucy Simler, "The Landless Worker: An Index of Economic and Social Change in Chester County, Pennsylvania, 1750-1820," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114 (1990): 163-200; Paul G. E. Clemens and Lucy Simler, "Rural Labor and the Farm Household in Chester County, Pennsylvania, 1750-1820," in Stephen Innes, ed., *Work and Labor in Early America* (Chapel Hill, 1988), 106-43.

[33] Jackson Turner Main, 193; Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 73; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 9, 72-82, 94, 101, 126, 207, 216, 265, 287-88, 330-31. Franz's findings for Paxton are worth reiterating: "Paxton consistently experienced a very high rate of geographical mobility during the period 1750-1782. On the average, based on the consecutive year listings, (1756-57-58, 1771-72-73) one-fifth of the tax-paying population was new to the community each year. At the same time over one-third of the taxpayers would leave the community each year for an average yearly mobility rate of 51.25 percent. Over two six year periods, 1750-56 and 1773-79, the mobility rate was almost 75 percent." *Paxton*, 127.

[34] B. G. Smith, *The Lower "Sort"*, 173-75; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 110-11.

[35] Wolf's numbers in *Urban Village* confirm for Germantown the "often stated but rarely proved thesis that close to half of the American colonial population was unchurched" (215-16), and she notes that "only 22 percent of the Germantown estate inventories mentioned Bibles" (216, n. 35).

[36] Joan M. Jensen, *Loosening the Bonds: Mid-Atlantic Farm Women, 1750-1850* (New Haven, 1986); Lisa Wilson Waciega, "A 'Man of Business': The Widow of Means in Southeastern Pennsylvania, 1750-1850," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 44,1 (1987): 40-64.

[37] Carole Shammas, "The Female Social Structure of Philadelphia in 1775," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107 (1983): 69-83; Salinger, "'Send No More Women': Female Servants in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107, 1 (1983): 29-48. Salinger's conclusions should be tempered with a reading of Grubb, "Servant Auction Records," 161-63.

[38] Merril D. Smith, *Breaking the Bonds: Martial Discord in Pennsylvania, 1730-1830* (New York, 1991); Jean R. Soderlund, "Women in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania: Toward a Model of Diversity," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 115,2 (1991): 181.

[39] G. S. Rowe, "The Role of Courthouses in the Lives of Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania Women," *The Western Pennsylvania History Magazine*, 68,1 (1985): 5-23; "Women's Crime and Criminal Administration in Pennsylvania, 1763-1790," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 109 (1985): 335-68; Sharon Ann Burnston, "Babies in the Well: An Underground Insight into Deviant Behavior in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 106 (1982): 151-86.

[40] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 138; Barry Levy, "Birth of the 'Modern Family' in Early America," in Zuckerman, ed., *Friends and Neighbors*, 26-64; Susan Klepp, "Five Early Pennsylvania Censuses," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 106 (1982): 500; Louise Kantrow, "Philadelphia Gentry: Fertilityand Family Limitation Among an American Aristocracy," *Population Studies* 34 (1980): 21-30; Daniel Blake Smith, "The Study of the Family in Early America: Trends, Problems, and Prospects," *Population Studies* 36 (1982): 8; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 293-97.

[41] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 326; Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 138-39; Rodger C. Henderson, "Demographic Patterns and Family Structure in Eighteenth-Century Lancaster County, Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 114 (1990): 349-83.

[42] Leo Schelbert, "People of Choice: Decision-Making in an Eighteenth-Century Peasant Family," *The Report: A Journal of German-American History* 40 (1986): 77-95.

[43] B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 200; and Wolf, *Urban Village*, 315-16.

[44] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 315.

[45] Wokeck, "Harnessing the Lure," 206-8, 221-22, 228-29.

[46] Bernard Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics* (New York, 1968), 64; Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*.

[47] Mark Häberlein, "German Migrants," 572-74, quotation from 572; B.G. Smith, 91, 124; Lucy Simler, "The Landless Worker," 163-200.

[48] William R. Shepard, *The History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania* (New York, 1896), 50-51; Franz, *Paxton*, 90. For the record, many of the squatters were German-speakers. Franz, 88.

[49] Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 4-6, 11-15; Franz, *Paxton*, 135, 182-216, 340; Shepard, *Proprietary Government*, 34, 64-65, 70; Russell S. Nelson, "Backcountry Pennsylvania: The Ideals of William Penn in Practice," (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1968), 59-60, 69, 75-76, 83; Francis Jennings, "The Scandalous Indian Policy of William Penn's Sons: Deeds and Documents of the Walking Purchase," *Pennsylvania History* 37 (1970): 23-24; Beverly Lemon, *The Quitrent System in the American Colonies* (New Haven, 1919), 135-36; Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 87; Marshall Harris, *Origin of the Land Tenure System in the United States* (Ames, Iowa, 1953).

[50] Frank Shuffleton, ed., *A Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America* (New York, 1993), 7; Sally Schwarz, *"A Mixed Multitude:" The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York, 1987).

[51] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 8.

[52] Greene and Pole, *Colonial British America*, 150.

[53] Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 150.

[54] Ibid., 163, 173, 178, 216, 218.

[55] Grubb, "Colonial Immigrant Literacy: An Economic Analysis of Pennsylvania-German Experience, 1727-1775," *Explorations in Economic History* 24,1 (1987): 63-76; Alan Tully, "Literacy Levels and Educational Development in Rural Pennsylvania,1729-1775," *Pennsylvania History* 39 (1972): 301-12.

[56] Farley Grubb, "Educational Choice in the Era Before Free Public Schooling: Evidence from German Immigrant Children in Pennsylvania, 1771-1817," *The Journal of Economic History* 52,2 (1992): 363.

[57] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 50-51; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 178-205, 283-90, 300-3, 309-10, 386-87; and id. "'The Origin of Whatever Is Not English Among Us': The Dutch-Speaking and the German-Speaking Peoples of the Colonial British America," in Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (Chapel Hill, 1991), 264; Robert E. Cazden, "The Provision of German Books in America During the Eighteenth Century," *Libri* 23 (1973): 89, 93.

[58] Schwarz, *A Mixed Multitude*, 7.

[59] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 138.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Schwartz, 297.

[62] Schwartz, 300.

[63] Becker, "Diversity," 206.

[64] Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 60-61.

[65] Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, 22; and id. "The Agricultural Practices of National Groups in Eighteenth-Century Southeastern Pennsylvania," *Geographical Review* 56 (1966): 467-96.

[66] Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 134.

[67] Franz, *Paxton*, 34, 79-82, 173; for more on the polarization of ethnic groups see William H. Egle, *History of the Counties of Dauphin and Lebanon in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Biographical and Genealogical*, 3d. ed., (Philadelphia, 1883), 33; Daniel Rupp, *History of Lancaster County*, (Lancaster, 1844), 288-89; Wayland F. Dunaway, *The Scotch-Irish in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Chapel Hill, 1944) 58-59.

[68] Don Yoder, "The Irish and the Dutch," *Pennsylvania Dutchman* 2 (1 June 1950): 6; and id. "The Pennsylvania Germans," 42.

[69] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 197.

[70] Becker, "Diversity," 211, second quote is from 212-14.

[71] Becker, "Diversity," 203; Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, xiv; Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 135; B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort"*, 152; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 58; and Roeber notes that the "British-American assessment" of Palatines in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania mirrored that of free-church settlers in the German southwest fifty years before (95).

[72] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 157.

[73] Yoder, "The Pennsylvania Germans," 42; Becker, "Diversity," 200-1.

[74] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 137-38; see also Daniel Snydacker, "Kinship and Community in Rural Pennsylvania, 1749-1820," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 13 (1982): 41-61.

[75] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 168.

[76] Yoder, "The Pennsylvania Germans," 42; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 98-99.

[77] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 178-79; Becker, "Diversity," 202.

[78] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 97.

[79] Ibid., 327; Becker, "Diversity," 201-2.

[80] Schwarz, *Mixed Multitude*, 96.

[81] Ibid., 96.

[82] Tully, *William Penn's Legacy*, 42-65.

[83] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 286-87.

[84] Julian Boyd et. al., eds., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Princeton, 1956), 13:48.

[85] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 139-42.

[86] B. G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort,"* 3.

[87] Wolf, *Urban Village*, 146.

[88] Ibid., 147; Yoder credits this push for English with having generated a "mass Pennsylvania German inferiority complex" in "The Pennsylvania Germans," 46.

[89] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 203.

[90] Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 168; Wolf, *Urban Village*, 153.

[91] Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 309; Steven Rosswurm, *Arms, Country, Class: The Philadelphia Militia and the "Lower Sort" During the American Revolution*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1987).

[92] Wolf, "Hyphenated America," 71.

[93] Yoder, "The Pennsylvania Germans," 44.

[94] Roeber quoting Sauer, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, 197-98.

[95] Benjamin Rush, *An Account of the Manner of the German Inhabitants of Pennsylvania*, Schmauk and Rupp, eds. (Lancaster, 1910); see also Susan M. Johnson, "Benjamin Rush and the Pennsylvania German Farmer as Noble Savage," *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 29 (1994): 49-57.

[96] Stepanie Wolf has described this process perhaps best in "Hyphenated America": "In Germantown, the most obvious error is the assumption that the built environment represented a 'German' picture rather than an adaptive response to a unique situation by a community continually in the process of creating its own patterns" (76). . . . "The question of ethnicity may, in the end, be one of self-identification and contrast. By 1800 communal life in Germantown bore no resemblance to the 'Germanopolis' of Pastorius's vision or to Penn's 'German town' of Dutch weavers. It was made up of people involved in a cultural context of economic and social interchanges, shared habits of living and ideas of style and taste, and perhaps a local manner of speech, who carefully distinguished within the town itself between 'themselves' and the 'others.' Whatever they called themselves, the 'others' labeled them 'quaint' and 'German.' In time the myth became the reality, and it is likely that whatever survived of the underlying culture of colonial Germantown became more 'German' during the nineteenth century as a result of acceptance of the myth by both sides" (82). See also Wolf, *Urban Village*, 140-41.